

would like to note, however, that the "storage medium" of the claims is intended to encompass both electronic and paper storage of data. In response to the objections in paragraphs 17 and 18 of the Office Action, applicant has also amended the abstract and title.

Turning to the substance of the claims, paragraph 21 of the Office Action has rejected claims 1-30 under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting with reference to claims 1-94 of United States Patent No. 4,839,835. To overcome this rejection, applicant intends to execute a terminal disclaimer, an unsigned copy of which is attached to this amendment as Exhibit A. An executed original will be submitted as soon as possible.

Concerning the objection to the drawings made in paragraph 19 of the Office Action applicant is submitting under separate cover suggested amendments to the drawings.

Finally, with this amendment applicant is submitting a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) that identifies several patents and other printed publications, which have been presented to the applicant in connection with licensing negotiations. In this regard, the amendments to claims 1-30 have been made in a manner to ensure that the claimed invention is distinguishable from any of these references that are prior art to the claimed invention. In this regard, the present application is a combination of two parent patent application serial nos. 717,042 and 874,273 (now U.S. Patent Nos. 4,839,835 and

4,831,539, which are in turn continuation-in-part applications of U.S. application serial no. 604,739 (now U.S. Patent No. 4,630,227). Applicant invites the Examiner to consider each of these references and make them of record herein.

In view of this application's claim of priority based on these parent cases, each of the present claims are believed to be fully supported by the disclosures of either the '835 patent or the '539 patent. Moreover, some of the claims are believed to be fully supported by the earliest parent -- i.e., the '227 patent, filed April 27, 1984. Applicant reserves the right to establish priority of invention, if appropriate, in response to a rejection based on a reference whose effective date is after April 27, 1983.

A proposed amendment to the drawings responsive to the objections in paragraph 19 of the Office Action is being submitted under a separate cover letter.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the application is considered in good and proper form for allowance and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

If in the opinion of the Examiner a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (312) 616-5600.

Respectfully submitted,

By John B. Conklin
John B. Conklin, Reg. No. 30,369
One of the Attorneys for
Applicant(s)
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312) 616-5600